REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 17, 20 and 23 are amended.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Patel and Examiner Mariam to Applicant's representative during the October 5, 2004 personal interview. The personal interview is summarized below and thus constitutes Applicant's record of the interview.

Applicant also appreciates the indication of allowability for claims 11 and 12. However, for the reasons discussed below, Applicant submits that all of claims 1-25 are allowable.

Claims 1-8, 15 and 17-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Rhyne et al. (Rhyne), U. S. Patent No. 5,511,135. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rhyne fails to disclose a stroke data editing device with a stroke data retrieving unit that selectively retrieves at least one piece of the stroke data stored within the stroke data storage unit according to a predetermined condition, the retrieved stroke data corresponding to at least one stroke included in a predetermined area, as recited in claim 1, or retrieving means for selectively retrieving at least one piece of the stored stroke data from the storing means according to a predetermined condition, the retrieved stroke data corresponding to at least one stroke included in a predetermined area, as recited in claim 17. Rhyne also fails to disclose a method for editing stroke data with the step of retrieving selectively at least one piece of the stored stroke data from the memory according to a predetermined condition, the retrieved stroke data corresponding to at least one stroke included in a predetermined area, as recited in claim 20, or a computer-readable memory with a program for selectively retrieving at least one piece of the stroke data from the memory according to a predetermined condition,

the retrieved stroke data corresponding to at least one stroke included in a predetermined area as recited in claim 23.

Rhyne fails to disclose all of the features of claim 1, 17, 20 and 23 because Rhyne fails to place a predetermined condition on how strokes are selectively retrieved within a single stroke data storage unit. Rather, Rhyne separates the strokes according to a predetermined condition (i.e., whether the strokes are stored in a normal mode or in an error mode) before the strokes are routed to and stored in one of two storage devices. During the personal interview, the Examiners argued that the predetermined condition was whether strokes should be retrieved from a storage device associated with the normal mode or the storage device associated with the error mode. Claims 1, 17, 20 and 23 have been amended to clarify that strokes are selectively retrieved within a single stroke data storage unit and that the strokes are selectively retrieved based on a predetermined condition.

Rhyne discloses a stylus-input recognition correction manager that allows error correction procedures in order to provide consistency in the user interface (Abstract). In order to implement the error correction procedures, a SIRCOM 210 includes a Stroke Router 310 that has two modes (col. 7, lines 37-41). The first mode is a normal mode in which received strokes are routed to a recognition manager 320 for storage and processing by the HWR 170 (col. 7, lines 43-45). In other words, the strokes are sent to a first storage device (i.e., the recognition manager 320 of the SIRCOM 210). The second mode is an error mode in which strokes are routed to an auxiliary SIRCOM which is associated with an ECP 180 (col. 7, lines 46-47). The auxiliary SIRCOM will typically send the forwarded strokes to its recognition manager 320 for storage and recognition (col. 7, lines 47-49). In other words, the strokes are sent to a second storage device, (i.e., the recognition manager 320 of the auxiliary SIRCOM).

Page 2 of the Office Action associates the storage device, the storage means and the memory of claims 1, 17, 20 and 23 with Rhyne's data storage device 245. However, the data storage device 245 is only described as being a peripheral component (col. 5, lines 44-47).

Thereafter, the ECP 180 can retrieve strokes that are located in the recognition manager 320 associated with the SIRCOM 210 or the recognition manager 320 associated with the auxiliary SIRCOM (col. 7, lines 54-60). However, Rhyne fails to provide any disclosure with regard to placing a predetermined condition as to how strokes are selectively retrieved from the recognition manager 320 associated with the SIRCOM 210 or as to how strokes are selectively retrieved from the recognition manager 320 associated with the auxiliary SIRCOM. Determining whether strokes should be retrieved from one of two recognition managers 320 is not the same as selectively retrieving strokes within a single recognition manager 320 according to a predetermined condition. Rhyne thus suffers deficiencies as identified in Applicant's specification in that a larger amount of processing time is required in order to retrieve all of the strokes from one of two recognition managers 320.

Accordingly, Rhyne fails to disclose all of the features recited in claims 1, 17, 20 and 23, as well as the additional features recited in the dependent claims. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 10, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rhyne in view of Zank et al. (Zank), U.S. Patent No. 6,307,955. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Zank also fails to disclose all of the features recited in independent claims 1, 17, 20 and 23

Zank is directed to an electronic signature management system that is capable of authenticating handwritten signatures. Zank is able to authenticate handwritten signatures by using, among other things, pen pressure and pen velocity in order to match signatures. Again,

Zank fails to set any predetermined conditions as to how signature data is retrieved from the memory. Column 7, lines 68 – col. 8, line 21 of Zank only states that the unlock signature step 64 extracts the electronic signature from the signed document file that was previously loaded.

As such, Zank also fails to disclose all of the features recited in claims 1, 17, 20 and 23. As such, the combination of Rhyne and Zank fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1, 17, 20 and 23 as well as the additional features recited in the dependent claims. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-25 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Date: October 28, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461